

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

Information Service

VOL. III NO. 14

SEPTEMBER 14, 1927

CONTENTS

	Page
Resignations of Cecil and de Jouvenel Direct Critical Attention to League Meetings	199
Secret Meetings of Large Powers Defended and Criticized	200
Reduction or Evacuation of the Rhineland Forces	200
Disarmament Problem Chief Issue Before the League	202
Questions Listed on Provisional Agenda of the Eighth Assembly	203
Election of Non-Permanent Council Members	204
Non-Political Activities of the League	205
Questions on Provisional Agenda of Forty-sixth Session of Council	206
Germany and the Mandates Commission	206
Authority of the Mandates Commission	207
Hungarian-Rumanian Dispute over Transylvania	208
Annex I—Agenda of the Eighth Ordinary Session of the Assembly	209
Annex II—Draft Provisional Agenda for the Forty-sixth Session of the Council	210

Published bi-weekly by the Research Department of the FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, 18 East 41st St., New York, N. Y.
JAMES G. McDONALD, Chairman; Subscription Rates: \$5.00 per year; to F. P. A. Members, \$3.00; Single Copies, 25c.

Problems Confronting The September (1927) Sessions of League Council and Assembly

THE recent resignation of Viscount Cecil from the British Cabinet—and as a consequence from the British delegation to the League of Nations—and the retirement of Senator Henri de Jouvenel from the French delegation to the Assembly, have directed critical attention to the present meetings of the League Council and Assembly which convened in Geneva, September 1 and 5 respectively. Both of these statesmen resigned on issues vitally affecting the League. Lord Cecil, who has been a leading British representative at Geneva ever since the League was founded, withdrew because of a fundamental disagreement with the majority of his cabinet on the broad question of disarmament, both as revealed during discussion of the various League projects advanced since 1923, and the Coolidge Naval Conference this summer. Senator de Jouvenel, an equally prominent member of French delegations to the League, and former French High Commissioner to Syria, declined to go to Geneva this month because he felt that his Government had not shown full confidence in the League by refusing to submit to it really im-

portant problems, and by reverting to the old methods of diplomacy, in which the great powers reached decisions and the smaller ones submitted.

The manner in which the League handles the issues emphasized by the resignations of Lord Cecil and M. de Jouvenel will be followed closely by its adherents, and its opponents during the present sessions. The attitude of the large and small states toward the League itself, no less than the solution of the disarmament problem is generally regarded as a criterion of the future usefulness of the League.

A study of the agenda for the present Assembly reveals a vast number of items relating to the routine activities of the League and the work of the many commissions and special committees which are functioning in various fields. At the same time it shows a surprising lack of significant political questions.* While experience has shown that

*See Annex 1. Agenda of the Eighth Ordinary Session of the Assembly, p. 209.

This agenda was published in May, 1927, and is therefore only provisional.

some of the more important problems are added to the agenda at the last moment, often by the Assembly itself, the fact remains that many more are never discussed in the formal meetings of the Assembly, or for that matter, the Council. The tendency of European statesmen to take advantage of the September meetings at Geneva for private discussion of important questions has become more marked in the past few years, and has been the subject of considerable comment among League members.

The practice has been defended—usually on behalf of the larger powers—on the ground that small private conferences permit a free exchange of opinion without fear of premature publicity and often lead to fruitful understandings which might not be reached in public; that the method of informal conversation is far better than the ponderous practices of traditional diplomacy; and that a great deal of time is saved by eliminating much of the meaningless oratory of formal public sessions. The famous Thoiry luncheon of Briand and Stresemann last September is cited as a case in point by defenders of this recent practice.

On the other hand, the increase of these extra-agenda activities has alarmed many representatives of the smaller states who fear that the larger countries will reach secret agreements without giving them a chance to be heard on questions affecting their vital interests. They argue that open discussion is one of the basic principles on which the League was founded and that if the present practice is continued, the sole function of the Assembly will be to affix its rubber stamp upon decisions reached in the Council by the larger powers. They further assert that the failure to keep any record of private conferences held outside the League is a serious handicap to its proper functioning. In defense of their contention many of the smaller states cite the discouraging results of the secret conferences which accompanied the meetings of the extraordinary Assembly and the Council held in March, 1926, to consider the admission of Germany to the League. While these opinions have seldom been voiced openly in the meetings of the Assembly, they have frequently found veiled expression in informal debates.

REDUCTION OR EVACUATION OF THE RHINELAND FORCES

Chief among the questions not listed on the present provisional agenda, but which are likely to be discussed in Geneva, is the issue of the Rhineland occupation. Despite the assurances of M. Briand a year ago and the transfer of the supervision of German disarmament from the Interallied Military Control Commission to the League in February, 1927, the Rhineland remains a sore spot in the relations between France and Germany.

During the past summer, the press has been full of rumors and reports about the question of the reduction of the troops of occupation in the Rhineland. As a well-informed authority writes us:

Everybody in Germany speaks of the political stagnation of Locarno. Public opinion had imagined that the developments would be much faster and is disappointed that Thoiry produced no results. The big thing which interests the German people is evacuation. I believe that Dr. Stresemann exaggerates when he says that public opinion is no longer prepared to pay whatever necessary for the withdrawal of the French troops. That is an attitude which is taken at the beginning of a negotiation. In reality, if the evacuation were in sight, the Germans would be perfectly willing to make sacrifices to obtain it. I believe that Dr. Stresemann will put the question of evacuation in September on exclusively juridical grounds by invoking Article 431 of the Treaty of Versailles. While waiting, or rather to permit waiting, he asks the French Government to withdraw simultaneously about 10,000 men from the occupied territories. The French reply that they have withdrawn 8,000 of them since Locarno and that they have already given back 3,000 dwellings. Dr. Stresemann says that there are 68,000 men in the Rhine province, although he had been promised that the number would be reduced to about 45,000. The French reply that this number of 68,000 is exaggerated. The Germans are a bit irritated at the distrust which France does not cease to display. "What are we to do?" they ask. "Nothing is sufficient. Today they ask us to give up the control of the destruction of the eastern fortresses, in spite of the suppression of the control; tomorrow they will ask us to give up our right to have the Dawes Plan revised; after tomorrow it will be something else, and we never see hope for a change. Under these conditions, what is the use of negotiating about small things? It is more worth while to speak only of the large ones."

The difficulty of the question of the evacuation of the Rhine province is that one does not know

whether the occupation guarantees the security of France or the payment of the reparations. The French play one stop or the other in turn. When security is guaranteed they speak of reparations. When the reparations are paid, they speak of security. They have already said that evacuation would be easier if they had guarantees on the further demilitarization of the Rhine province.

In the field of reparations, the French fear that the day when they leave the Rhine province, the Germans will immediately propose the revision of the Dawes Plan. The German Government asks: Who is making you believe that? We have never spoken of it. The Allies reply: Your newspapers have spoken of it and Dr. Schacht instigated a panic on the Bourse of Berlin the other day in order to prove that Germany cannot make her payments. Stresemann replies: That is not true; Dr. Schacht merely wished to stabilize the mark in order to be able to pay you.

PUBLIC OPINION ON THE RHINELAND ISSUE

Since June, public opinion in France and Germany has more and more focussed on the Rhineland question. The British Government has also been occupied with it. M. Poincaré has resumed his earlier custom of making Sunday speeches in French towns in the old war area and has revived old atrocity stories and inflamed opinion against the Germans. The advent of the German Nationalists in the Reich Cabinet has tended to make that Government more uncompromising and speeches have been made in Germany which the French have not liked. The British are reported to be supporting the Germans in their demand for reduction of the Rhineland forces. The Belgian Government has also accused Germany categorically of non-fulfillment of her disarmament agreements. A report by a French General, published a few weeks ago, accuses the Reich of doing its utmost to organize semi-military forces within the demilitarized Rhineland zone to act as a frontier defense body whenever the armies of occupation have been withdrawn.

Mindful of promises made at Locarno and Thoiry, M. Briand has urged on the French Cabinet a substantial reduction of the troops in the Rhineland. M. Poincaré's Cabinet of National Union has been most unwilling to

see more than a total of 5,000 British, Belgian and French troops withdrawn, and categorically accuses Germany of non-fulfillment of her disarmament obligations, despite the fact that the Interallied Military Control Commission left the Reich in February and that a commission of investigation has since reported that the Eastern fortifications have been satisfactorily dismantled. Furthermore, the French maintain that the Rhineland troops must remain in order to see that Germany complies with the terms of the Dawes Plan.

The British Government is anxious to see the Locarno spirit revived by substantial reduction of the occupying forces. Strong notes have been written to Paris, and it is now semi-officially stated that approximately 10,000 men will be withdrawn in all, but that some British troops will stay on the Rhine. The approximately 70,000 troops now occupying the area will be cut down to 60,000, France reducing her forces by 8,000, Great Britain by 1,000 and Belgium by 1,000.

Thus Dr. Stresemann, if these reports are correct, will be faced by Allied agreement on concessions to be made. German opinion is well summarized in a recent editorial in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*:

... It is highly necessary that the Locarno Treaties bring aid to the German people. There can be no talk of buying this assistance by new German concessions. Whatever is decided in this matter in Paris, London and Brussels will be only the realization of categorical promises. It is openly said on the other side that something must happen before they can meet the German Foreign Minister in Geneva again. It is, throughout, the business of the Government of the Reich to carry out the *Politik* of Locarno. But on the other side, it must be clear that no one will accomplish anything in this problem by attacking it from a purely military angle and that only the strengthening of trust in peace will really serve to better Franco-German relations upon which in the first instance, this peace depends.

The whole question must be viewed in relation to the general European political situation and the French fear that once the occupying forces are reduced, Germany will demand revision of the Dawes Plan and perhaps a further revision of the Versailles Treaty. The colonial question and the settle-

ment of the Eastern frontiers of Germany as well as her relations to Poland; the Anschluss question made more acute by the recent Vienna riots—all will doubtless play a part at Geneva.

DISARMAMENT REGARDED AS URGENT PROBLEM

The question of disarmament, while not on the provisional agenda of either the Assembly or the Council, is another matter which will surely come up for discussion during the meetings. Almost eight years of constant work and study have been devoted to this important phase of the League's activity. Ever since 1920 the problem has occupied the constant attention of one League commission or another. But the failure of the projects of 1923 and 1924—the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance, and the Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes—coupled with the serious difficulties which have confronted the Preparatory Commission for the League's Disarmament Conference, have left the problem just about where it stood at the beginning.

The prospects for the Disarmament Conference are far from encouraging. The Preparatory Commission met again this year from March 21 to April 26, with the United States represented, but made little progress. The British and the French delegations each submitted a draft convention prepared to facilitate the establishment of a single text as a basis for discussion by the Conference, but the Commission was unable to agree on all the points discussed and in the end confined itself to indicating those points on which unanimity had been obtained. This text is characterized as primarily a document for study and is divided into five chapters dealing with effectives, war material, budgetary expenditures, chemical warfare, and miscellaneous provisions, and has been referred to the various governments for study before being taken up when the Preparatory Commission meets again in November.

Meanwhile the Three-Power Naval Conference called by President Coolidge has ended in failure, and Lord Cecil, one of the foremost advocates of disarmament and an

important member of many British delegations to the League, has resigned his position in the British Cabinet. The effect of these two recent developments on the disarmament program of the League is purely a matter of conjecture. The failure of the Naval Conference, however, is likely to be raised in discussions of the Third Commission of the Assembly, which is constituted to deal with disarmament. Furthermore, the German delegation will undoubtedly take the occasion to point out once more that Germany has fulfilled its disarmament obligations under the Versailles treaty, and that it expects the other powers to disarm to the lowest point consistent with national safety, as provided in Article 8 of the League Covenant.

EFFECT OF COOLIDGE CONFERENCE ON LEAGUE

With regard to the probable effect of the Naval Conference on the League's program, our Geneva correspondent writes as follows:

The lesson of the Conference is that disarmament is impossible if one separates the large problems from general politics. The idea of limiting armies without altering policies seems more and more contrary to reality. This was fully understood by the League of Nations in 1924, when it drew up the Geneva Protocol to make disarmament possible. Following its rejection by Great Britain, the cart was put before the horse and the attempt made to start with disarmament. This is why no result was reached. General disarmament proving to be very difficult, the chief naval powers sought to gain by meeting separately. The result was the same. It is the more symptomatic that the will to disarm of the three delegations was incontestable and that the failure was the result not of duplicity but of technical difficulties.

As someone remarked recently, the powers desired to reduce expenses without diminishing security. But this problem is insoluble if attacked independent of general political considerations. Only compulsory arbitration can make possible its solution, and so long as the Anglo-Saxon countries, and particularly Great Britain, refuse to join in any compulsory arbitration, the possibilities of disarmament are very remote.

The question remains as to what the repercussion of this failure will be upon the League of Nations. While the Conference met outside the League, it had a relation to it, and no one at Geneva is pleased at its collapse. I have heard it said that this will be a good lesson to those who wish to do without the League and do their

own work, but this opinion is not generally held.

It is possible that the Preparatory Commission will profit by the experience of the Naval Conference. Lord Cecil, for example, who has always opposed the French thesis of security, took it up himself as far as the navy was concerned. On the other hand Mr. Gibson adopted the French thesis of the limitation of total tonnage as opposed to the limitation of tonnage by categories. The stand taken on these questions may exercise a certain influence upon the work of the Preparatory Commission. But one can scarcely hope that they will make it any easier.

On the other hand the failure of the Naval

Conference threatens to create an unfavorable political atmosphere for the discussions of the Preparatory Commission in November. The Anglo-Saxon powers have posed heretofore as the champions of disarmament and have intimated that if it depended upon them, matters would go faster. The striking failure, which was not even hidden, must have as its effect the diminution of the authority of their preachings. It will re-enforce national feeling in all countries and the doubts regarding solutions of international problems. It will strengthen the resistance of countries which do not desire disarmament and which will be able to follow the bad example which has been given to them.

QUESTIONS LISTED ON PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE EIGHTH ASSEMBLY

The twenty-five subjects listed on the Assembly agenda, while not touching either of the questions above, indicate the wide range of the League's activities. The first seven items deal with the election of the President, the adoption of the agenda, nomination of committees, the election of chairmen, election of three non-permanent members of the Council, and the report of the work of the Council and the Secretariat. The next eight items are inserted by the Assembly or arise from its decisions, and include the annual report by the Council on the Slavery Convention, the question of contributions in arrears, the report on protection of women and children in the Near East, the question of introducing proportional representation, the report on the work of the International Economic Conference, and two other minor questions. The remaining items deal for the most part with reports from technical organizations of the League, such as the work of the Economic and Financial organizations, the Organization for Communications and Transit, the Health Organization of the League; the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, the special Commission of Inquiry on the Cultivation of the Opium Poppy in Persia, and the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children, the work of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation.

A few of these items, which are listed in full in Annex I, are of sufficient general interest to warrant fuller comment. The election of the president and the committee chairmen and the examination and adoption of the agenda are more or less routine affairs.

In order to facilitate its discussions the League Assembly divides the work of the session between six Commissions, each of which meets under the chairmanship of one of the vice-presidents of the Assembly, elected annually by that body. These vice-presidents, together with the president of the Assembly and the Secretary-General of the League constitute a sort of steering committee of the Assembly.

The six Commissions are comprised of one delegate from each state represented at the Assembly and the discussion of the agenda is divided up between them as follows:

First Commission. *Constitutional and Legal Questions.*

Second Commission. *Work of the Technical Organizations.*

Third Commission. *Disarmament.*

Fourth Commission. *Budget and Questions of Internal Administration.*

Fifth Commission. *Social Questions.*

Sixth Commission. *Political Questions.*

The Assembly debate on the report of the Council, item number 6, is of some importance. Theoretically this debate affords the Assembly an opportunity to express its views on the work of the previous year and indirectly to influence the progress of the League. In actual practice, however, the Assembly has seldom exercised its prerogative, and the debate has become of little importance. Although many delegates from the smaller countries have often expressed

a desire to discuss such matters as the extra-agenda activities of the large states, mentioned above, few have ever translated this desire into a critical speech.

It may be pointed out in this connection that the Council is not responsible to the Assembly and that this discussion does not have the character of a debate on a ministerial declaration. The competence of the two bodies is identical, and the Assembly has exhausted its right of action as concerns the Council when it has elected the non-permanent members of the Council. However, if a general revolt were raised by the Assembly against the Council, there is no doubt that it would have considerable affect on the latter.

ELECTION OF NON-PERMANENT COUNCIL MEMBERS

The election of non-permanent members of the Council, item 7, is of particular interest to the small League states.

The method of election was changed by the adoption of the resolution passed by the Assembly last September at the time of Germany's admission. It will be recalled that this resolution attempted to satisfy the demands of Spain, Brazil and Poland for permanent Council seats by increasing the number of non-permanent seats from six to nine, thus making room for three "semi-permanent" seats. The text of the resolution, adopted unanimously, is as follows:

Article 1—The non-permanent Members of the Council shall be increased to nine in number.

Article 2—The non-permanent Members of the Council shall be elected for a term of three years. They shall assume office immediately upon election. One-third of the number of Members shall be elected each year.

Article 3—A retiring Member may not be re-elected within a period of three years commencing with the date of expiration of its mandate unless the Assembly shall so decide, either at that date or in the course of three years, by a majority of two-thirds; the number of Members thus re-elected shall not, however, exceed one-third of the total number of non-permanent Members of the Council.

Article 4—Temporary Provisions.

1. In 1926, the nine non-permanent Members of the Council shall be elected by the Assembly, three for a period of three years, three for a period of two years, and three for a period of one year.

2. Of the nine Members thus elected in 1926, a maximum of three may be immediately declared "re-eligible" by a decision of the Assembly taken upon a special vote and adopted by a majority of two-thirds of the number of votes.

3. Any qualification of "re-eligibility" recognized in advance in 1926 in the case of one, two or three Members elected then shall not affect the right of the Assembly to have recourse in 1927 and 1928 to the option provided in Article 3 for the benefit of other non-permanent Members retiring from the Council in those years. It is, however, understood that, if three Members are already qualified for re-election in 1926, the Assembly shall only make use of its right in very exceptional cases.

Both Spain and Brazil withdrew from the League when it appeared that they would not be granted permanent seats on the Council. Following the adoption of the resolution, the Assembly elected nine non-permanent members in accordance with the temporary provisions of Article 4, as follows:

Poland, Rumania and Chile, elected for three years;

Holland, Colombia and China, elected for two years;

Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and Salvador, elected for one year.

The three countries last mentioned, therefore, are the only members of the Council retiring this year. Our Geneva correspondent, commenting on the election of states to fill these vacancies, writes:

"If Argentina comes back to the League before September its election is certain.* If this is not the case it will be rather difficult to find an acceptable candidate among the Latin American States not at present represented on the Council. Greece and Finland are mentioned for the other two seats, but it is not impossible that Belgium may be re-elected by special vote."

While the question of contributions in arrears, Number 9 on the agenda, is of minor importance, it raises a question which has come up on several occasions as a result of the continued failure of a few countries, notably China, to pay their annual dues to the League. The question of what measures could be taken against states which do not fulfill their financial obligations was first studied four years ago by the Commission on Amendments to the Covenant. This Com-

*Argentina withdrew from the Assembly in 1920, and while it has not formally resigned, it has attended no Assemblies since.

mission came to the conclusion that the League could not resort to the severe sanctions provided for in Article 16 of the Covenant. The Assembly has gone into the matter several times since then, but the Latin American states have always stood together to prevent any decision being taken. Last September the Council was asked to present a report to this year's Assembly. The Council has virtually concluded that no action can be taken without amending the Covenant.

The question of introducing the system of proportional representation in the election of non-permanent Council members, item Number 11, was raised by the Assembly last year and referred to the Council and the Secretariat. The Council did not favor the proposal and it will probably be dropped this year.

A proposal that the humanitarian activities of the League be extended to include the question of alcoholism, item Number 12, was advanced at the Seventh Assembly by the delegates of Finland, Poland and Sweden. The matter has been taken under consideration and will be discussed again this year.

HUMANITARIAN ACTIVITIES OF THE LEAGUE

The Council report on the Slavery Convention, Number 8 on the Assembly agenda, is merely a memorandum from the Secretary-General of the League to the effect that thirty-seven states have signed this convention, which was concluded at Geneva in 1926. The memorandum lists the following states who have signed: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, British Empire, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Persia, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Spain, Sweden, Union of South Africa and Uruguay.

Consideration of the report on the work of the International Economic Conference,

item Number 15, is expected to bring up the question of the composition of the future economic organization of the League. Our Geneva correspondent points out that the problem is whether the Economic Committee will remain as it is—a consultative organ of the Council composed of persons who, although serving only in their capacity as individuals, are not without connection with their governments—or whether it should become an organ representing public opinion and the interests of economic life, comprising representatives of the employers, the workers and the cooperatives. The representation of labor has created great difficulties, as the Italian Government will not hear of introducing in any form the influence of the Second International to the Economic Committee. It is probable that the present Committee, which has been somewhat lacking in initiative, will be enlarged, but it is impossible to predict whether the Italian opposition will be sufficiently strong to triumph over the demand of the workers to be represented on the Committee.

WORK OF THE OPIUM COMMITTEE

The current work of the committees and organizations of the League, items 16 to 22, is for the most part too technical to permit a useful review. The work of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, however, may be mentioned in passing. The Assembly will be asked for credits for the creation of the Central Board, provided for by the Second International Opium Convention signed in Geneva in 1926. This Board, to consist of eight members appointed by the Council, will follow the course of the international trade in narcotics, and will receive statistics of production, consumption, import and export from the contracting parties. The appointment of the Board is dependent upon the coming into force of the Convention, which will take place after ratification by ten powers, including seven states represented on the Council, two of which must be permanent members. The Convention has so far been ratified by twelve powers, including five states represented on the Council, two of which are permanent members. Our

Geneva correspondent writes that a strong opposition is shaping up against the Central Board. Certain delegates declare that it is not logical to make all the members of the League defray the expenses of an institution from which only a small number will profit. On the other hand, the text of the Convention, initiated under the auspices of the League, is explicit, and up to the present the Assembly has never refused credits for the carrying out of a Convention worked out under these conditions.

Another matter which will come before the Assembly is the report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Cultivation of the Opium Poppy in Persia. This Commission, appointed by the League of Nations, was in Persia between March and June, 1926, under the chairmanship of an American, Mr. Fredrick A. Delano. It has submitted a report

recommending the substitution of other crops for the opium poppy, and providing for a ten per cent per annum reduction of opium cultivation after a three-year period of preparation. It is expected that a delegate for Persia will comment on the plan outlined in the report, which according to Persia is not entirely specific in all of its recommendations.

With regard to meetings of the Council in case of a crisis, item Number 24, a committee of the Council has proposed that all members of the League of Nations agree by a solemn declaration which would bind them legally to facilitate a meeting of the Council and the functioning of the organs of the League in case of a crisis. As this agreement cannot be valid unless drawn up by the Assembly, it is possible that a protocol of signature may be opened at this session.

QUESTIONS ON PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE FORTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

As in the case of the Assembly, the published agenda for the forty-sixth session of the Council* is not final and matters of political importance are likely to be added during the course of the session.

GERMANY AND THE MANDATES COMMISSION

Of the questions on the provisional agenda, the report of the Permanent Mandates Commission, item 3, is among the most important. This report raises two questions: one relating to the possible appointment of a German member to the Commission; the other relating to the authority of the Commission itself.

In regard to the first, the Commission at its eleventh session, which met in Geneva from June 20 to July 6, 1927, adopted a carefully worded resolution declaring that it was not opposed to the nomination of a German member, but that it did not intend to assume the responsibility for deciding the matter which rightly rests with the Council. The majority of the Commission concurred in the view that there was no technical objection to the appointment of the new mem-

ber. The minority stated that it was prepared to welcome whatever decisions the Council might think fit to take, but considered that it should abstain from expressing an opinion in view of the political character of the question.

This leaves the matter squarely up to the Council and the Assembly. In reaching a decision, it is likely that political considerations will be taken into account. Since it was the Treaty of Versailles which deprived Germany of its colonies, any remote move which might be interpreted as a step towards their eventual restoration is viewed with some misgivings by the Allies, particularly France and Italy, who fear further precedents for revision of the Peace Treaty. Public opinion in Germany is somewhat divided on the subject of colonies. The Right-wing parties are strongly in favor of them, both for economic reasons and as a matter of international prestige. The Catholic Center Party, representing a cross-section of German voters, is somewhat divided on the subject. The Democrats are for the most part opposed to an active colonial policy and the Social Democrats are officially on record as against any acquisition of colonies by the

*See Annex 2. Draft Provisional Agenda for the Forty-sixth Session of the Council, p. 210.

Reich. The Communists are, of course, opposed to "imperialism" in all its phases. There are many other matters arising from the Versailles settlement and the Dawes Plan that Germany is anxious to have reconsidered, and it is possible that the question of a seat on the Mandates Commission may be used as a means for political bargaining.

AUTHORITY OF THE MANDATES COMMISSION

The second question referred by the Mandates Commission to the Council for final decision relates to the efforts of the Commission to obtain fuller information from the mandatory powers, and indirectly to the extent of the Commission's authority. Troubled by the often inadequate data at its disposal, the Commission in September, 1926, presented to the forty-first session of the Council a long list of questions which it proposed to submit to the mandatory powers for their guidance in drafting their subsequent annual reports. The proposal was bitterly opposed by the delegates of the mandatory powers represented on the Council. When the matter came up for discussion in the Council on September 3, 1926, Sir Austen Chamberlain, the British Secretary for Foreign Affairs, severely criticized the Commission and stated that a general feeling was growing among the mandatory governments that there was a tendency on the part of the Commission to expand its authority to a point where government would no longer be vested in the mandatory powers but in the Commission itself. He insisted that this was not the intention of the Covenant. These views were echoed by the French, Japanese and Belgian representatives on the Council.

At its last meeting the Mandates Commission, which is composed of individuals rather than representatives of governments, apparently abandoned any effort to bring the matter to an issue. After considering the opinions expressed in the Council, the Commission recalled that the list of questions "was drawn up for the use of the mandatory powers solely with a view to facilitating the preparation of the annual reports which these powers are bound to submit to the Council under the terms of Article 22 of the Covenant.

"Therefore," the Commission stated in its report, "it is entirely for the mandatory powers to decide whether they desire to use or not to use the 'List of Questions' according to whether they share or do not share the Commission's opinion as to its usefulness.

"The Commission must leave it to the Council to decide whether it still considers it desirable after these explanations to adopt any recommendation to the mandatory powers regarding this document."

If the attitude of the mandatory powers on the Council remains as intransigent as it was a year ago, there is little doubt that the resolution of the Commission will not be carried out and that that body will be forced to accept such limited authority as the mandatory powers deem expedient.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS ON AGENDA

The Report of the Economic Committee, number 4a on the agenda, will embody the reports of the International Economic Conference, held in Geneva last May. It is expected that some sort of commission or organization will be established to facilitate the carrying out of the program laid down at the Conference and prepare the way for future conferences. The report on the future constitution of the economic organization of the League, item 5, has been referred to in connection with the Assembly agenda.

The interpretation of Articles 190 and 192 of the Treaty of Versailles, item 9, was requested by the Greek Government. At the end of June, Greece applied to the Council for relief from a contract entered into with Germany in 1912 for the building in German yards of a battleship to be known as the *Salamis*. The case calls for the interpretation of two clauses in the Treaty of Versailles and of a recent bill introduced in the German Reichstag. Germany wishes to enforce the contract; Greece seeks to avoid it. The Versailles Treaty provides, in effect, that Germany shall not build warships for foreign delivery. The recent German bill seeks to except from such provision warships contracted for before 1914. The Council of Ambassadors has specifically refused to recognize the German bill as an interpretation of the treaty.

A plan providing financial assistance for states victims of an aggression, item 10, was drawn up by the Financial Committee and discussed at the last session of the Council. The scheme aims at organizing financial assistance for a state by a system on which the credit of the individual country is strengthened by association with that of other states. The credits would be obtained in the ordinary way in the money market, and the attacked state would itself contract a loan on the general security of its revenues, but with the aid of an international guarantee, whose mechanism would be similar to that applied in the case of the Austrian Reconstruction Loan. It is proposed that the scheme and general conditions should be embodied in a convention open for signature by the various states, but that a state should not benefit by it unless it becomes a party to the convention within a period to be fixed.

HUNGARIAN-RUMANIAN DISPUTE OVER TRANSYLVANIA

The dispute between Hungary and Rumania over Transylvania, item 13 on the agenda, has arisen as the result of the Peace Treaty of Trianon. By this Treaty, Transylvania became Rumanian territory, and the dispute is concerned with property held by Hungarians in Transylvania.

According to Hungarian sources, about 300 Hungarian land-owners in Transylvania found themselves dispossessed and their property virtually confiscated. Compensation had been granted them which amounted merely to 1 per cent of the value of the property and was not made in cash but in non-negotiable 5 per cent securities redeemable within fifty years. These securities, they claim, are not worth half their nominal value and the Hungarians ask for restitution or a property payment for their land.

The case has come before the Mixed Hungarian-Rumanian Tribunal in Paris which last year decided that it had jurisdiction to consider the claims. The Rumanians asserted that the court had no jurisdiction, but the plea was rejected.

Thereupon, the Rumanian Government informed the League Council that the Rumanian member of the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal would no longer attend meetings of this body. The Hungarian Government requested the

Council to appoint another arbitrator from a neutral state in accordance with the provisions of Article 239 of the Treaty of Trianon.

The Rumanian Government has denied the competence of the Tribunal and declared that to admit such jurisdiction would be to infringe Rumanian sovereignty. Furthermore, Rumania maintains that if the claims were awarded, the whole system of land reform in Rumania would be endangered besides giving Hungarians advantages in Rumania not enjoyed by Rumanian nationals.

At the March meeting of the League Council, the Rumanians contended that the case on which the League was asked to appoint another Arbitrator had already been decided four times—at the Peace Conference, at a conference between Hungarian and Rumanian representatives in Brussels in 1923, by the Council of the League on the basis of that Brussels Conference, and by the Rumanian courts. If the League now appointed an Arbitrator to fill the vacancy on the Mixed Tribunal it would stultify the action it took in 1923 according to Rumania.

All of M. Titulesco's statements as to fact and law were challenged by the Hungarian representatives who invited the Rumanians to submit the question of the Arbitral Tribunal's jurisdiction to the Permanent Court of International Justice. This invitation was not accepted by Rumania, and the Council requested Sir Austen Chamberlain and the Japanese and Chilean representatives to report on the question at the meeting of the Council in June. At the June session of the Council, Sir Austen Chamberlain proposed to Hungary and Rumania that they withdraw the question from the Council's agenda, but the Hungarian Government refused to do so. The matter was then postponed until the September meeting of the Council in order to give this sub-committee of three, time to make a further study of the question.

Items 14 through 18 of the agenda deal with disputes between Poland and the Free City of Danzig which are the result of strained relations between the two. The questions are as follows:

14. Transport of Polish munitions and implements of war in transit through Danzig: utilization of the Westerplatte Peninsula;

15. Harbor Board police; 16. Competence of Danzig Tribunals in the suit of the Danzig employees on the Polish Railway against the Polish Railway Administration; 17. Protection of Polish interests of Danzig nationals; 18. Manufacture of air-craft within the Free City: Report of the Air Sub-committee of the League Permanent Advisory Commission for Military, Naval and Air questions.

The background of Danzig-Polish relations

will be found in the Foreign Policy Association Information Service Report, Vol. III, No. 12, August 10, 1927, *German-Polish Relations*.

Many questions other than those treated in this report will obviously be discussed during the course of this month at Geneva. It is impossible, however, to indicate in advance just what other problems will assume the most significance.

ANNEX I

AGENDA OF THE EIGHTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY

(The following list gives no indication of the order in which the questions will be taken.)

1. Election of the Committee to report on the Credentials of Delegates.
2. Election of the President.
3. Examination and Adoption of the Agenda.
4. Nomination of Committees and Election of Chairmen of these Committees.
5. Election of Six Vice-Presidents.
6. Report on the Work of the Council since the last General Session of the Assembly, on the Work of the Secretariat and on the Measures taken to execute the Decisions of the Assembly.
7. Election of three non-permanent Members of the Council.

Items inserted by or arising out of the Decisions of the Assembly.

8. Slavery Convention: Annual Report by the Council.
9. Contributions in Arrears: Report by the Council on Legal Position of States which do not pay their Contributions.
10. Protection of Women and Children in the Near East: Final Report on the Work of Miss Jappe for 1926-27.
11. The System of the Single Transferable Vote, and the Principle of Proportional Representation in general, in Connection with the Problem of the Election of the Non-Permanent Members of the Council.
12. Question of Alcoholism: Proposal by the Finnish, Polish and Swedish Delegations.
13. Report by the Supervisory Commission on the Question of the Establishment of an Administrative Tribunal.
14. Consideration of the Draft Resolution proposed by the First Committee of the Assembly in 1926 on the Subject of What Questions are and What are not within the Sphere of Action of the League.
15. International Economic Conference: Report on the Work of the Conference.

Items proposed by the Council, together with Reports from Technical Organizations of the League.

16. Report on the Work of the Economic and Financial Organization, including the Work of the Greek Refugees Settlement Commission, Establishment of Bulgarian Refugees, Banking and Currency Reform in Estonia, Danzig Loan, Double Taxation, Counterfeiting Currency, Bills of Exchange, Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions, etc.
17. Report on the Work of the Organization for Communications and Transit; including the Work of the Third General Conference.
18. Report on the Work of the Health Organization of the League.
19. Report on the Work of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs.
20. Enquiry into the Cultivation of Opium Poppy in Persia: Report of the Commission of Enquiry: Observations of the Persian Government.
21. Report on the Work of the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People:
 - (a) Report of the Committee on Traffic in Women and Children.
 - (b) Report of the Child Welfare Committee.
22. Report on the Work of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.
23. Accessions to International Agreements, given subject to ratification.
24. Proposal of the Committee of the Council that the Assembly should be invited to adopt a General Resolution affirming the Principle of the Obligation incumbent upon the Governments Members of the League to facilitate the Meeting of the Council in case of Emergency by every Means in their Power.
25. Budget for 1928, including the Budgets of the International Labor Organization and of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Audit of Accounts for the Eighth Financial Period (1926).
Reports of the Supervisory Commission.

ANNEX II

DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE FORTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

1. Budgetary and Administrative Questions:
 - (a) Transfers in the Budget for 1927.
 - (b)
 - (i) Audit of the accounts for 1926 of the grants of the Rockefeller Foundation towards the Budget of the Health Organization.
 - (ii) Accounts for 1926 of the Far Eastern Bureau for Epidemiological Intelligence.
 - (c) New Work involving New Expenditure on the part of the League: Draft Report to the Assembly.
 - (d) Report of the Salaries Adjustment Committee.
 - (e) Appointments to and Promotions in the Secretariat: Report by the Secretary-General.
2. Report of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.
3. Report of the Permanent Mandates Commission.
4. (a) Report of the Economic Committee.
(b) Resignation of M. Pirelli from the Economic Committee.
5. Report on the future constitution of the Economic Organization of the League.
6. Report of the Greek Refugees Settlement Commission: Greek Government Loan: Report of the Financial Committee.
7. Report of the Financial Committee.
8. Reports on the progress made in the execution of the recommendations of the Council of the 14th December, 1925, regarding the properties of Refugees from Bulgaria and Greece.
9. Interpretation of Articles 190 and 192 of the Treaty of Versailles—Cruiser Salamis: Request submitted by the Greek Government.
10. Financial assistance for States victims of an aggression.
11. Establishment of Armenian Refugees.
12. Armenian and Russian Refugees: Letter from the High Commissioner for Refugees forwarding resolutions adopted at the Conference of Government Representatives on June 15th-16th, 1927.
13. Request of the Roumanian Government under paragraph 2 of Article II of the Covenant regarding its communication addressed to the Mixed Roumano-Hungarian Arbitral Tribunal on February 24th, 1927:

Request of the Hungarian Government for the appointment by the Council, in virtue of Article 239 of the Treaty of Trianon, of two deputy arbitrators for the Mixed Roumano-Hungarian Arbitral Tribunal.
14. Danzig: Transport of Polish Munitions and Implements of War in transit through Danzig: Utilization of the Westerplatte.
15. Danzig: Harbour Board Police.
16. Danzig: Competence of the Danzig Tribunals in the suit of the Danzig employees on the Polish Railway against the Polish Administration.
17. Danzig: Protection of Polish interests of Danzig nationals: Ruetzen Kositzkau case.
18. Danzig: Manufacture of aircraft within the Free City: Report of the Air Sub-Committee of the Permanent Advisory Commission.
19. Report of the Conference of Press Experts.
20. Report on the meeting of Health Experts in Child Welfare and on the technical mission in the Argentine, Brazil and Uruguay.
21. Report on the International Conference for the establishment of an International Relief Union.
22. Supplementary Report of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit on communications with the League in times of crisis.
23. Report on the Third General Conference for Communications and Transit.
24. Position as regards the ratification of Agreements and Conventions concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations: Report by the Secretary-General.